

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,345	04/09/2004	Robert J. Antonellis	345 P002	1000
7590 06/07/2006 Law Office of Marc D. Machtinger, Ltd.			EXAMINER	
			FADOK, MARK A	
Mr. Marc D. Machtinger, Esq. 750 W. Lake Cook Road, Suite 350		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	IL 60089-2073		3625	
			DATE MAILED: 06/07/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/821,345	ANTONELLIS, ROBERT J.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Mark Fadok	3625			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. 9 period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 N	March 2006.	·			
·	-	s action is non-final.				
3)	,					
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under t	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Dispositi	on of Claims					
	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-225</u> is/are pending in the application.					
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
·	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,10,23,30-34,76,122,129,142,149-153,183 and 184</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar.				
•	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Evaminer			
10)	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· ·			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
a)[a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
* 0	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
	the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	·u.			
Attachmen	t(s)					
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate			
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 2-9,11-22,24-29,35-75,77-121,123-128,130-141,143-148,154-182 and 185-225.

Art Unit: 3625

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Election

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to office action mailed 2/28/2006, which was received 3/13/2006. Acknowledgement is made to the election of group IA without traverse that includes claims 1,10,23,30-34,76,122,129,142,149-153,183 and 184.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1,10,23,30-34,122,129,142,149-153 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by August et al. (US 2002/0143638).

- 1. An order optimization system, comprising: a device, said device being capable of communicating with an establishment computer and transmitting an order to said establishment computer (FIG 1, item 11), said establishment computer having software enabled means for receiving said order (FIG 1, item 17), assigning resources to said order (FIG 6, item 143), and commanding the fulfillment of said order (FIG 6).
- 10. The order optimization system according to claim 1, wherein said device is a telephone (FIG 2, item11).

23. The order optimization system according to claim 1, wherein said software enabled means for receiving said order comprises a telephony system, wherein said order is input via audible communication (FIG 2, item 16).

Page 3

- 30. The order optimization system according to claim 1, wherein said means for receiving said order comprises software enabled mean for displaying a series of hierarchal menus on a visual display (FIG 9).
- 31. The order optimization system according to claim 1, wherein said means for assigning resources to said order comprises software enabled means for determining the availability of at least one limiting resource necessary to fulfill said order (FIG 6, item 141).
- 32. The order optimization system according to claim 31, wherein said means for determining the availability of at least one limiting resource necessary to fulfill said order comprises software enabled means for referring to a look-up table comprising information that associates different types of limiting resources with different types of orders (FIG 6, item 141).
- 33. The order optimization system according to claim 31, wherein said means for assigning resources to said order comprises software enabled means for determining a

Art Unit: 3625

set of components for said order, and software enabled means for determining the availability of at least one limiting resource necessary to fulfill each of said order components FIG 6, item 141).

34. The order optimization system according to claim 33, wherein said means for determining the availability of at least one limiting resource necessary to fulfill said order components comprises software enabled means for referring to a look-up table comprising information that associates different types of limiting resources with different order components (FIG 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 76, 183 and 184 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over August in view of McDonald, Jr. et al (US PGPub 20020077750) and further in view of Borton (US PG pub 20020188492).

In regards to claim 76, August teaches providing information about the completion and availability of orders (FIG 10), but does not specifically mention that this information along with assigned, unassigned and reassigned information is provided to a delivery driver. McDonald, Jr. teaches providing status information to delivery drivers

Application/Control Number: 10/821,345 Page 5

Art Unit: 3625

(FIG 3). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to include in August providing scheduling information to the drivers

because displaying this information to assigned drivers would prevent the driver leaving

the store without all the required deliveries (Borton, page 1, para 0012).

In regards to claims 122,129,142,149-53,183 and 184, these claims are

considered parallel claims to claims 1,10,23,30-34 and 76 and are rejected for the same

rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Mark Fadok whose telephone number is (571) 272-

6755. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Thursday 8:00 AM to 5:00

PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)

272-3600.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Art Unit: 3625

Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

[Official communications; including

After Final communications labeled

"Box AF"]

(571) 273-6755 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Mark Fadok

Primary Examiner